

PAST MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS

WEST END AREA PLANNING GROUP MEETING #1 MINUTES

MEETING #1

Rebecca Barnes, Moderator

Date: April 10, 2002
Time: 6:30-8:30 p.m.
Location: One Longfellow Place, Wadsworth Room, Boston MA
City Staff Attending: *Boston Redevelopment Authority:* Rebecca Barnes, Robert Kroin, Susan Hannon, Kim Jones, Leanna Hush, Katie Lee, Sonal Gandhi, David Carlson
Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services: Janine Coppola
Boston Transportation Department: Vineet Gupta, Jim McCarthy, Alison Felix
Boston Public Works: Para Jayasinghe
Councilor Paul Scapicchio's Office: Mark Chardavoyne

West End Area Planning

Group Members Attending: Malek Al-Khatib, Biss Antikarov, Joseph Chiaramonte, Harold Dennis, Bill Donohue, Linda Ellenbogen, Patrick Faherty, Jr., John Fitzgerald, Jane Forrestall, David Hanitchak, Norman Herr, Paula Higgins, Al Marks, Jackie Mastrangelo, Kevin McNamara, Liz Minnis, Bob O'Brien, Carol Robinson, Paul Schratter, Ivy Turner, Carolyn Wahto, Robert Works

The meeting began at 6:40 p.m.

Welcome

Rebecca Barnes, Chief Planner for the City of Boston and Moderator of the West End Area Planning Group effort, welcomed everyone to the meeting and provided an overview of the planning process, reviewed the night's agenda and began introductions. The Planning Group members introduced themselves as well as members of the public and city staff in attendance. Rebecca Barnes then recognized Representative Demakis in the audience, who spoke to the importance of this area of the city. Rebecca Barnes then introduced Bob Kroin, Chief Architect for the BRA, who began his presentation.

Presentation of West End Area History and Circumstances

Bob Kroin presented an overview of the history of the West End Area, and provided some comparisons between this neighborhood and other parts of Boston.

MEETING #1 cont.

Discussion

The discussion began with a question from the Planning Group regarding the ability to be visionary in these discussions of the West End Area with the many preconceptions of the Area. A member of the Planning Group commented that it was the Urban Renewal Plan that allowed for the urban density and open space which was why she chose to live in the West End. Parking concerns were also expressed. Bob Kroin responded that open space needs to be maintained, but the Area need not be all open space—it can be a mix of high-rise and low-rise buildings.

Questions regarding the planned development projects for the Area and the possibility/plans for a supermarket were asked. Rebecca Barnes responded that the development projects that will be presented at future meetings are the projects that the community is already familiar with, as those are the projects the City is familiar with as well.

Numerous requests for more information on the West End Urban Renewal Plan were made. A suggestion was also made for having members of the Zoning Board of Appeal, BTB and the Police Department attend future meetings.

Many Planning Group members expressed their belief that the West End Area was the best community to live in and noted that Charles River Park was an award-winning concept. A suggestion was made to create a list of resident's likes and dislikes of the area to be used as a starting point for discussion.

Rebecca Barnes then opened the discussion to everyone at the meeting:

A resident commented that they felt that the presentation was unfair in that it compared the best snapshots of Boston to the worst of the West End Area. It was suggested that planning should come first, then zoning and then development. Rebecca Barnes responded that in an ideal world, this could happen, but we live in a place with previously established legal and physical constraints. Equity Residential was asked to shelve their plans for Emerson Place until the end of the planning process.

When a moratorium on development was requested, it was explained that the BRA has no legal right to stop a developer from filing and that stopping development may or may not be possible. Rebecca Barnes stated that the City is hoping to convene all interests in these meetings.

A resident commented that they felt that the presentation was biased to promote density. Rebecca Barnes responded that the City is not promoting any proposals in these meetings. Other comments from the community and Planning Group members included traffic concerns during Fleet Center events, the lack of theaters and art galleries in the area, housing affordability, maintaining the existing open space and the creation of more open space. Residents stated that they moved to the West End Area for the open space and that it should be preserved. A second request for a list of likes/dislikes (pros/cons) of the area was made. Rebecca Barnes agreed to the list.

Rebecca Barnes closed the meeting stressing that the City is not selling any proposals. The planning process is a forum to share opinions and review the legal and social conditions and issues in the area—to recognize the values and realize them. **MEETING #1 cont.**

The meeting closed at 9:00 p.m.

NEXT MEETING:

Tuesday, May 7, 2002, 6:15 p.m. to 8:15 p.m.

MGH O’Keefe Auditorium

All are welcome.

WEST END AREA PLANNING GROUP MEETING #2 MINUTES

MEETING #2

Rebecca Barnes, Moderator

Date: May 7, 2002
Time: 6:15-9:00 p.m.
Location: Shriners Hospital Auditorium, Boston MA
City Staff Attending: *Boston Redevelopment Authority:* Rebecca Barnes, Robert Kroin, Kim Jones, Leanna Hush, Katie Lee, Sonal Gandhi, Rick Shaklik
Boston Transportation Department: Jim McCarthy, Alison Felix

West End Area Planning

Group Members Attending: Malek Al-Khatib, Biss Antikarov, Harold Dennis, Bill Donohue, Linda Ellenbogen, Patrick Faherty, Jr., John Fitzgerald, Jane Forrestall, David Hanitchak, Paula Higgins, Al Marks, Jackie Mastrangelo, Kevin McNamara, Liz Minnis, Bob O’Brien, Carol Robinson, Paul Schratter, Ivy Turner, Robert Works, Emilie Pugliano

The meeting began at 6:30 p.m.

Rebecca Barnes summarized the process for this initiative, the schedule and the proceedings of the first meeting (held on April 10th at Longfellow Place). Questions and comments from both the Planning Group and the audience revealed a common request to adapt the schedule to include a “summer break.” This would better accommodate the schedules of many participants and would allow for time to digest the information

MEETING #2 cont.

being presented in these first several meetings. Rebecca agreed to make appropriate changes and redistribute a new schedule (see “**West End Area Planning meeting schedule UPDATE**” below).

Participants then separated into 10 small groups to discuss the question:

In thinking about the future of the West End Area, what values do you want to be sure are represented and carried out through planning and development efforts?

Groups were asked to think about the answer to this question as it pertains to the following elements:

- 1) Character and Livability
- 2) Activity and Use
- 3) Access and Circulation
- 4) Relationship to surrounding areas

Rebecca polled the audience to see how everyone felt about the idea of adjusting the evening’s agenda by moving the scheduled zoning and urban renewal presentation/discussion to a later meeting, and instead devoting the remainder of the evening to the reports from the breakout groups. There was consensus to do this.

The attachment in your email entitled “**Charts-meeting #2**” contains the notes from each of the 10 groups. The attachment “**Summary of individual responses at West End meeting 2**” details the responses we received from the eighteen participants who submitted their own written answers to the same questions discussed in the small groups.

GROUP RESPONSES: VERBATIM NOTES

GROUP #1

Special about West End

- Open Space
- Accessibility to neighborhoods and amenities
- Combined urban/suburban qualities
- Park-like atmosphere
- Sense of Community
- Unique identity
- Pedestrian thoroughfares
- Quality views for many residents
- Sense of safety
- Diverse population

Enhancements to West End

MEETING #2 cont.

- Cambridge Street improvements
- North Station area upgrade
- Lower noise level (Garden garage, helicopters)
- Wm. Cardinal O'Connell way safety
- Improve Blossom Street
- "Main-stream" supermarket
- Movie Theater
- Visual and Performing Arts

GROUP #2

- Enhance residential area.
 - West End is contained. New proposals will not work. A wall around.
 - Enhance connections.
- Retain and want open space-like a walkable park.
 - Needs of residents need to be met
 - Too much traffic during the day—needs improvement
 - Idea of road through Blossom to Martha Way to split area—not a good idea
 - Like safe area
 - Contrast-balance of residential-commercial
- Enhance human-small-scale balance.
 - Equity is asking for too massive, high building
 - Improve public transportation—add more small service businesses
- Subzones of residential should be maintained.
- Want appropriate growth.

GROUP #3

Special—Want to Preserve:

1. Green Space, birds, trees, low density of buildings
2. Close-knit stable community, many long-term residents
3. Availability of amenities, health care, social activities, City Hall, Federal services within walking distance
4. Pedestrian friendly, access to public transportation

MEETING #2 cont.

5. Close to Esplanade, River
6. Safe neighborhood
7. Diversity of ages, income, ethnicity...welcoming to all
8. Car-free zone in midst of busy area
9. Availability of off-street parking
10. A community that works better than most

Things we can Improve:

1. Public opinion of our neighborhood
2. Connections between buildings and surrounding areas
3. Accessibility for all, better maintained sidewalks, curb cuts, traffic crossings
4. Attractiveness, aesthetic improvements
5. Improve appearance of surrounding public buildings
6. Address homelessness and vagrants on perimeter
7. Air quality, Big Dig, MGH diesel busses, hazardous waste, medical waste, leaking dumpsters
8. Too many busses and trucks on Cardinal O'Connell Way
9. Unsightly security measures like jersey barriers around public buildings
10. More brick, less concrete, more planters, more attractive lighting
11. Upgrade Science Park and Bowdoin stations
12. Improve pedestrian overpasses to Science Museum, Esplanade
13. Improve signage and reconfigure pedestrian walkways
14. Unattractive edges (Martha Road, Charles Street extension, Blossom St., etc.)
15. Noise from Helipad, Fleet Center Garage, Loading ramps

GROUP #4

Current:

- Diversity: Business/Residential, Social/Economic
- West End has a very well defined image: open space, quiet, unique

Future:

- Maintain affordability and stability
- Can we expand or make better use of West End boundaries, specifically to be used for Residential
- Restrict density levels
- Residential support services, (i.e., schools, retail, recreational)
- Preserve open space and character

Current: (activities)

MEETING #2 cont.

- Value open space and residential
- Value live and work
- Value proximity to other resources of city

Future: (activities)

- Need more open green space
- More retail storefronts
- Quiet enjoyment of residential areas with proper balance of entertainment licenses
- Better recreational activities for the neighborhood's lifestyles

Current:

- Very walkable area in a city known as the "Walking City"
- Safe and secure

Enhance:

- Maintain and beautify
- Increase safety and security
- Easier access through MGH to Charles Station
- Stop Cardinal Way being used as a shortcut
- Help overall infrastructure
- Improve Science Park station

Current:

- One of safest neighborhoods in City (BPD)
- West End has strong sense of community

GROUP #5

Special:

- Park like—Open
- Vertical Neighborhood, Sense of Place
- Views of City-sunset, river, city, State House, CITGO
- Acceptable density, not NYC
- Surrounded by Institutional Uses
- Residential provides open space, circulation for institutions and public
- Exception to typical residential development; stability and safe (inst/res)

MEETING #2 cont.

Improvements:

- Preserving, returning, and improving green space, light, air, sun
- Connection to institutions—outlying areas
- Supermarket
- Senior services
- Reduce traffic, noise, congestion within Blossom Street/Storrow Drive
- Institutions pay more attention to residential
- Limit density/height—surrounding areas to be developed—Nashua St.
- Science Park/Charles circulation

GROUP #6

Character and Livability:

- City and River views
- High Density—Green Open Space
- Layout is conducive to neighborhood environment (Community)
- Layout is conducive to security
- Diversity and Demographics

Ideas on how to Improve:

- Submerge open parking lots and develop more open space for recreational/social activities

Activity and Use:

- Access and Circulation
- Pedestrian circulation
- Proximity to public transportation
- Concerns about increased circulation

What can we improve upon?:

- Vehicular circulation by enhancing alternative transportation
- Accessibility to Green Line

GROUP #7

MEETING #2 cont.

Good

Better

1. "Park-like," open space, mid-city
2. Retail balance towards residential
3. Traffic Access, Thoreau Path, Security
4. Attractive

- Maintain/Strengthen
- Upgrade North Station,
Cambridge St., Grocery Store,
Local Services, Arts
- Can Improve: access to subway,
elderly access, pedestrians at
grade
- Enhance Landscape,
Residential, Other

GROUP #8

Special:

- Residential should stay residential
- 48 acres? Unique to world?
- Beauty of City with open space
- Vital active neighborhood
- Great location—public transportation
- Convenience
- Affordable housing (large proportion?)
- Students
- Diversity without tension
- Seniors
- Safety—lighting, security guards
- Neighborhood
- Quiet green/gardens
- Views (don't want NYC)
- Stability—long-time residents
- Hospital as a "wall"—huge
- What do we have to give up?
- Are the "fringes" fair ground?
- Development on Nashua Street?
- Don't lose the uniqueness of the residential/high rise park area
- Parking/Congestion increased fear of future development
- Access for vehicles
- Sunlight

MEETING #2 cont.

- Parking should be shielded as much as possible
- Concern about maintaining healthy mix of residential/commercial/institutional
- Market—Pace's good addition, need more of this (institutions have taken it over)

GROUP #9

- Open Space Preserved
- Quiet areas an oasis
- Maintain beautiful landscape
- No more high-rise buildings
- Build an elementary school
- Better street lighting, downward facing lights
- Keep views, access to sunlight, air for existing buildings, support home values
- Don't add traffic to Blossom Court
- Maintain safe environment for children
- Adequate fire protection
- Don't add to traffic congestion in and around West End
- Any new buildings to blend into existing architecture
- No need to change West End beyond changes already in process
- Expand West End with housing in direction of Nashua Street, with access from Charles River Park commercial development
- Reduce pollution from vehicles serving the area
- Maintain recreation facilities

GROUP #10

- Security
- Open Spaces/Green
- Unique, not gated, quieter than city
- Value diversity
- Lowest cost of living in city
- Multiple access points
- Balance between institutional, retail and residential (world class hospital)
- Architecture blends in
- Recreational facilities/access

Activity:

- Pedestrian-friendly
- Open Space
- Parking Balance
- Health clubs
- Security
- Basketball

Access and Circulation:

MEETING #2 cont.

- Vehicle access issue—maxed out
- MBTA improvements needed
- Bike racks
- Car parking
- MBTA accessibility
- Crosswalks—poor location
- No sticker parking
- Access to jobs
- Residential within institutional area (not recognized as such by outsiders)
- Diversity of the area—has a uniqueness
- Access to other neighborhoods on foot

Future:

- Open space—keep and add
- Facilitated access points to institution
- Grocery store
- Bike path
- Residential development on Nashua Street
- Charles River Park should have more retail
- Improve Science Park stop
- Bad access to North End
- Add lighting on surrounding streets
- Deter homeless
- Boston Licensing Board—better to continue in North Station area
- Noise/Air pollution in Fleet Center area
- Better access to river
- Infrastructure
- Low crime rate
- Open Space retained
- Uniqueness
- Not trapped—multiple access
- Economic diversity and cultural diversity
- Recreational facilities
- Pedestrian-friendly

MEETING #2 cont.

The remaining notes summarize individuals' written responses to the same aforementioned question (page 48).

1. CHARACTER AND LIVABILITY

What is special?

- Open space was an element that people enjoy very much; this was listed as something to be “retained” (often mentioned)
- There is a lot of “light” (2)* and it feels like “an oasis” (3) in the city.
- Safety for children and the elderly
- Socioeconomic diversity
- That the West End is “unique to Boston,” and “well-defined”
- Maintenance of the recreational facilities (from the notes it was difficult to tell if this fell under the “can be enhanced” category)
- Inside of the buildings “holds up very well”
- History
- Home values
- Attractive
- Convenient (3)
- Views (4)
- Urban yet surrounded by trees and grass”/urban-suburban feel
- “Characterized by contrasts”—old and new, quiet yet busy, mixes of uses
- History of world-class medicine (2)

What can be enhanced?

- Updated street lighting (3)
- Architecture of the buildings is “not attractive”; would like to find ways of improving this (2)
- “more rather than less open space is needed to balance buildings”
- Maintain affordability and stability
- “Clean up—Cambridge Street homeless—drunks”
- “Jail—get rid of it. Maybe put a new building there”
- “Lindemann is ugly (2)—give it a face lift”
- Public art, fountains
- More appropriate fencing
- Seating conducive to socializing
- “Return green space and trees forfeited to the Big Dig” (2)
- More/better trees, grass, plantings (2); mulch is not an okay substitute
- “No buildings built up at sidewalk edge”

**Note: Numbers in parentheses refer to how many times something was mentioned in the individual responses.*

2. ACTIVITY AND USE**MEETING #2 cont.**What is special?

- Outdoor seating at *Pace's* is a nice amenity (3)
- Being able to “meet neighbors for a chat” in the plaza (2)
- “Proximity to resources/work” (5)
- “Gateway to the city from the North”
- Hardware stores
- Restaurants
- “Improved housing for families—rebuild townhouses”
- Available parking (2)

What can be enhanced?

- “No new development to increase density (4)”
- “Appropriate” growth (2)
- Maintain balance of uses (2)
- “Reduced scale could be enhanced; large scale seems to be predominant”
- “Too much institutional use now—it walls off neighborhood”
- One person found it undesirable that the MGH had converted a restaurant to a cancer center
- Retain/Need more “residential services”—retail! restaurants, dry cleaners, senior services, schools, retail store fronts (6); don’t lose them to medical offices (1)
- Keep noise level down (2)
- Maintain city infrastructure (2)
- Dedicated recreational areas for children and families; Better shared playground for all residents
- Cinema/theater/performing arts space (3)
- Supermarket options (5) (Some liked the idea of a Bread & Circus, some liked the idea of a more traditional grocery market)
- Community Center (2)
- Art galleries (2)
- Reopen pool on Esplanade
- “Bring engineering (electronics) firms”
- “Retain park-like core, build and improve commercial use on the perimeter”
- Expand the library

MEETING #2 cont.

3. ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

What is special?

- Ideal for those who do not drive—close to “T” (5)
- “Circular streets reflect patterns of original Boston”
- Pedestrian aspect throughout (4)—maintain this
- Limited vehicle traffic within park
- Safe (6)

What can be enhanced?

- Ensure multiple access points, open to the community at large; but retain sense of community and safety aspects (2)
- Put all garages underground (3)
- Reduce traffic (5); “we are overwhelmed by traffic on Storrow Drive and Martha Road now”
- Access from Storrow Drive, Martha Road is poor (2)
- Beautification
- Pedestrian safety at crossings (3); more “Walk” lights (Cardinal O’Connell, Blossom, and Cambridge streets all mentioned)
- Enforce parking laws on streets (events at the Fleet Center)
- Opportunity to remove elevated Green Line tracks
- Green Line handicap access in general & Science Park station need upgrades (3)
- Better overpasses to T and Esplanade
- More parking for visitors as well as residents
- Limo parking
- Better access through MGH campus (3) “don’t want to have to go through hospital to reach Cambridge Street”
- Access to Whittier by car is poor
- Reconfigure some pathways
- Not well-marked street signs
- Easier interchanges between T buses and commuter rail lines
- Improve surrounding roads (especially Cambridge Street)
- Put a new park along Blossom Street where parking garage is, not a new high-rise
- Bike paths
- Vehicles are restricted by the limited streets

4. RELATIONSHIP TO SURROUNDING AREAS**MEETING #2 cont.**What is special?

- Great to be able to walk to the Charles River Esplanade and the harbor (4)
- Strong sense of community/stability
- Easy access to other neighborhoods
- Visitors from other parts of the city for tourism, etc.
- More housing units coming onto market in the immediate surrounding areas
- Strong medical history

What can be enhanced?

- Conversion of Charles River Plaza to commercial use will add to the “walling off” of the West End from the rest of the city
- Develop Nashua Street and Bullfinch Triangle area for housing (5) [especially affordable housing (1)]; to link North End and West End
- “Keep control” of entertainment/liquor licenses;
“The area of North Station could use some improvement in “class” of businesses—to attract less of the panhandler part of society”
- Too much like an “institutional back door” now (2)
- Need an “easier way to walk to Charlestown”
- “Fleet Center attendees trash our neighborhood and are disruptive (e.g., drunk, noisy, argumentative)”
- Encourage surrounding institutions to improve the aesthetics of the portions that face Charles River Park
- Feels “somewhat isolated” from surrounding neighborhoods: improve connections

MEETING #3

****NEXT MEETING: JUNE 4, 2002 AT SHRINERS HOSPITAL AUDITORIUM AT 6:15 p.m. (Beacon Hill Times published the incorrect location.)**

WEST END AREA PLANNING GROUP MEETING #3 MINUTES

Rebecca Barnes, Moderator

Date: May 22, 2002
Time: 6:15-9:00 p.m.
Location: Shriners Hospital Auditorium, Boston MA
City Staff Attending: *Boston Redevelopment Authority:* Rebecca Barnes, Keith Craig, Owen Donnelly, Sonal Gandhi, Kim Jones, Robert Kroin, Katie Lee
Boston Transportation Department: Alison Felix, Vineet Gupta, Jim McCarthy

West End Area Planning

Group Members Attending: Malek Al-Khatib, Biss Antikarov, Richard Cirace, Harold Dennis, Bill Donohue, Linda Ellenbogen, Patrick Flaherty, Jr., John Fitzgerald, Jane Forrestall, David Hanitchak, Norman Herr, Paula Higgins, Al Marks, Jackie Mastrangelo, Kevin McNamara, Liz Minnis, Bob O'Brien, Emilie Pugliano, Carol Robinson, Paul Schratter, Ivy Turner, Carolyn Wahto, Robert Works

The meeting began at 6:15 p.m.

Rebecca Barnes welcomed the Planning Group and other community members in attendance. She addressed the change in schedule as requested at the previous meeting. A break will be taken during the months of July and August and the meetings will begin again September. Rebecca suggested a weekend workshop for the first meeting in September after the summer break, in order to regroup and refocus on the possible outcomes of this process. The Planning Group will be consulted during the summer regarding the workshop format and contents. The process is scheduled to end in late October.

PROJECT PRESENTATIONS

MEETING #3 cont.

EQUITY RESIDENTIAL: EMERSON PLACE

Presenter: Bill Donohue

The proposed concept for Emerson Place consists of the development of 529 new units of housing while maintaining the 444 units of housing in their two existing buildings. The concept also includes the construction of a 527-space underground parking garage. The same amount of existing green space will remain. Through the numerous community meetings, Equity has been informed of the community's concerns. These concerns include density, the need for larger more contemporary units, parking, affordability, security, the desire for rental and ownership opportunities, improving and maintaining the open space, and overall maintenance of and improvements to the park and the surrounding areas. Equity has also met with various property owners in the area. Moving forward, Equity will continue to listen to the community and evaluate all comments and concerns while participating in the BRA's West End Area Planning Process. A revised Letter of Intent will be submitted to the BRA, which will begin the public review process.

Questions and Comments for Equity:

Rebecca Barnes commented on the good news that Equity will be participating in the planning process and will wait until the end of the process, with the current schedule, to submit a development proposal to the BRA. The community expressed concern regarding the traffic impacts on Blossom Street/Court, the filing of the Project Notification Form (PNF) from Equity and whether the proposal will be within the current zoning. Equity responded that as long as the process keeps to the current schedule, they will not file until the process is complete and that the current plan is not within the zoning, but that they do not have a definite plan yet.

The community questioned whether someone from the EPA was in attendance. Rebecca Barnes responded that invitations were sent to the City and State environmental offices, as suggested. Concerns regarding the environmental effects were also expressed. Equity responded that they have hired engineers to study this, but until the plans are further along, it is difficult to proceed. Other comments included concern over the quality of the "If you lived here, you'd be home" sign and how it is representative of Equity's treatment of their residents and that they would like to see Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH), the Charles Street Jail Hotel and Equity work together.

CARPENTER & COMPANY: CHARLES STREET JAIL HOTEL

Presenter: Peter Diana

Carpenter & Company works primarily in the development of hotels. The Charles Street Jail Hotel will be similar to the Charles Hotel in Cambridge in terms of quality, size and intent. It will have approximately the same number of rooms, but less meeting and restaurant space.

MEETING #3 cont.

Improvements to the current condition of the area:

- The outside wall (around the site) will be taken down and replaced with a much lower, knee-high wall.
- The slate roof will be restored.
- The cupola will be restored.
- The outside of the building will be cleaned.
- Open space will be created on Charles Street in front of the hotel.

The driveway will be located on Charles Street as far from Charles Circle as possible. Cambridge Street will be avoided entirely by traffic entering the hotel from Storrow Drive. The only traffic that will effect Cambridge Street will be that coming from Downtown, which should be minimal. An interior road will be created, connecting the hotel to the MGH garage, which will provide the hotel with the necessary parking spaces. The hotel's floor plan is designed to allow public access to the historic site.

The Project Notification Form (PNF) has been submitted and the comment period ends on May 31, 2002.

Questions and Comments for Carpenter & Company:

The community questioned whether there would be parking space flexibility with MGH if the number of necessary parking spaces has been underestimated for the hotel and how many additional people the hotel would bring to the area. Carpenter & Co. responded that the parking analysis was done from a business standpoint, in that it is in the hotel's best interest to have sufficient parking, and that at maximum usage, which is rare, there would be 1000-1200 additional people.

The community commented that the hotel is going to be a great improvement and questioned the visibility of the open space in front of the hotel. Carpenter & Co. responded that it would be completely open with only a knee-high wall. Other questions and comments included the size of the ballroom and the penetrability of the area. Carpenter & Co. directed the penetrability question to MGH as the hotel is out of the way in terms of access for residents of the West End to the Charles/MGH T Station. The ballroom will be about 2/3 the size of the ballroom at the Charles Hotel in Cambridge, which is small to begin with.

MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL: YAWKEY CENTER FOR OUTPATIENT CARE

Presenters: Dr. Jean Elrick, David Hanitchak and John Messervy

MGH is proposing to develop approximately 640,000 (466,700 net new) square feet of ambulatory care and medical office space, together with a below-grade parking garage with approximately 725 (475 net new) spaces on its campus located off Cambridge Street. The proposed Yawkey Center for Outpatient Care will be developed in two phases. Phase 1 will be located south of Fruit Street and will span the eastern portion of the Charles Street Jail site towards Cambridge Street. The northern portion will be built on top of the existing Northeast Proton Therapy Center and the southern portion

will be located on top of the proposed below-grade parking garage on the Cambridge Street end of the former Charles Street Jail (proposed hotel). Phase 1 is scheduled to be completed in the spring of 2004.

MEETING #3 cont.

Phase 2 will be located north of Fruit Street at the current site of the Vincent/Burnham, Clinics and Tilton buildings, which would be taken down. Construction of Phase 2 should begin upon the completion of Phase 1.

Questions and Comments for MGH:

The community questioned whether there will be inpatients and if there will be improvements to the taxi service for the center. MGH responded that there will be no in-patients and that the hospital is studying the taxi situation for the entire campus. Two specific questions regarding the Fruit Street garage and whether MGH has plans to convert Fruit Street into a two-way street. MGH responded that the demolition of the Fruit Street garage will be within 10 years, as part of Phase 2 (2008) and that there is no commitment to make Fruit Street a two-way street, but that there have been discussions.

The community requested that the Cambridge/Blossom Street Working Group discussions be better advertised in the community and questioned if the meetings were advertised in the Beacon Hill Times. MGH responded that email is the current mode of notification. The email is not sent to a select list, but to individuals who live or own property on Cambridge or Blossom streets. The emails are also sent to the neighborhood groups, which were believed to be getting the information out to their members. MGH will also do whatever is necessary/desired by the community.

MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL: INSTITUTIONAL MASTER PLAN

Presenters: Dr. Jean Elrick, David Hantichak and John Messervy

Rebecca Barnes: MGH submitted the Institutional Master Plan (IMP) Notification Form to the BRA approximately 48 hours ago. It is being presented for the first time here tonight.

The Massachusetts General Hospital's mission strives for excellence in three areas: patient care, education and research. Over the next ten years, the hospital proposes a complete facilities plan, as part of its Institutional Master Plan, to address current demands and in order to continue to improve the three components of its mission. The plan includes leasing off-site space, additions to and updating of older facilities as well as a number of new construction projects.

Proposed new construction projects in the IMP include:

- A research facility on the eastern portion of Site 4B (bounded by Cambridge, Blossom, Parkman and North Anderson streets) above an underground parking garage on the site (2009-2012)
- The relocation of the Resident Physician's House to the southwestern portion

MEETING #3 cont.

of Site 4B fronting on Cambridge Street in order to allow for the creation of Cambridge Street retail space at its existing location (2012)

- A new steam and co-generation facility along with administrative space above the existing Service Building (2005-2007)
- Demolition of the Fruit Street Garage and construction of underground parking (2012-2015)
- Administration, ambulatory and retail space on the site of the existing Fruit Street Garage (2012-2015)
- A new Multi-Modal Transportation Center and parking garage for employees on the Nashua Street lot (2004-2007)

Leased space:

- Administrative and ambulatory space (2003)
- Charles River Plaza research building (2004)

Additions/Upgrades to existing facilities:

- Phase 2—Yawkey Center for Outpatient Care (2005-2008)
- Gray Jackson Building for the differential of inpatient beds not provided in the addition to the Yawkey Center in Phase 2 (2004-2007)

Beyond the terms of the IMP:

- Removal of the Parkman Street Garage and construction of approximately 600 below-grade parking spaces and 9-stories of administration and ambulatory space

Questions and Comments for MGH:

The community expressed concerns regarding the environmental impacts of the IMP. MGH responded that environmental studies will definitely be performed as part of the scoping for the IMP Notification Form (IMP NF). An explanation of the scoping was requested. MGH, Owen Donnelly and Rebecca Barnes explained that at the end of the comment period for the IMP NF, the City will review the comments received and define the scope of the IMP, i.e. an explanation of the concerns, desired uses and additional information and/or studies that need to be presented. MGH will then produce the IMP; there will be public review of the draft and a formal approval process.

Owen Donnelly explained that there is a different level of impact analysis for the IMP than for BRA Large Project Review. After the IMP is in place, each project will still go through the Large Project Review process. There will also be a master transportation plan as part of the IMP and individual project transportation agreements.

The community also questioned whether there is any plan for retail space on Blossom Street. MGH responded that there was and that what is actually chosen will be a discussion with the community. Other questions included whether MGH was equipped with an anthrax disaster plan, what are the plans for the red brick buildings across from the Holiday Inn, and what the Cambridge/Blossom Street working group

will study. MGH answered that yes, MGH has an anthrax disaster plan, the red brick buildings will be research facilities, and that the group will represent the concerns from everyone on the street and entire corridor.

MEETING #3 cont.

Community members also expressed their desires for residential projects on Nashua Street and improved pedestrian access through the institutional campus to Blossom Street.

Rebecca Barnes stated that the June 4th meeting will be the second of three 'Plans and Project Presentation' meetings. The Boston Transportation Department, Charles River Plaza, the MBTA and DCAM will be presenting.

The next meeting of the West End Area Planning Group will be held on Tuesday, June 4, 2002 at 6:15 p.m. at Shriners Hospital Auditorium.

Coming Up:

Meeting #4

Plans and Project Presentations
Tuesday, June 4, 2002
6:15 p.m.
Shriners Hospital Auditorium
Transportation Traffic Concerns
Charles River Plaza
MBTA
DCAM

Meeting #5

Plans and Project Presentations—II, III
Monday, June 24, 2002
6:15 p.m.
Shriners Hospital Auditorium
BTD: Overview of BRA: Zoning and
Urban and Renewal
North Area Working Group

MEETING #4

WEST END AREA PLANNING GROUP

MEETING #4

MEETING MINUTES

Rebecca Barnes, Moderator

Date: June 4, 2002
Time: 6:15-8:45 p.m.
Location: Shriners Hospital Auditorium, Boston MA
City Staff Attending: *Boston Redevelopment Authority:* Rebecca Barnes, Sonal Gandhi, Leanna Hush, Kim Jones, Katie Lee, Richard Shaklik
Boston Transportation Department: Alison Felix, Vineet Gupta, Jim McCarthy

West End Area Planning

Group Members Attending: Biss Antikarov, Richard Cirace, Harold Dennis, Patrick Flaherty, Jr., John Fitzgerald, Jane Forrestall, David Hanitchak, Norman Herr, Paula Higgins, Kevin McNamara, Liz Minnis, Emilie Pugliano, Carol Robinson, Paul Schratter, Ivy Turner, Carolyn Wahto, Robert Works

The meeting began at 6:30 p.m.

Rebecca Barnes welcomed the Planning Group and other community members in attendance. Requests had been made to have the DCAM presentation first, and Rebecca Barnes and DCAM were prepared to accommodate this request. Rebecca announced that MGH will ask the combined membership of the West End Area Planning Group and the Cambridge Street/Blossom Street Working Group to participate in the Institutional Master Planning Process for MGH. The public meeting for the MGH Master Plan is scheduled for June 19, 2002 at 6:30 p.m. in the Walcott Rooms in the Wang Ambulatory Care Center.

Rebecca Barnes also announced that the Planning Group will be meeting in the near future to discuss the format and content of the fall workshop and the products of this planning effort. The BRA will coordinate this meeting shortly. The public will be invited to the fall workshop.

PROJECT PRESENTATIONS

MEETING #4 cont.

DCAM: LINDEMANN CENTER, SALTONSTALL UPDATE

Presenter: Liz Minnis, Deputy Director, Courts

Liz began with a discussion of the master plan for the Suffolk Courts, including the new Brooke Courthouse (completed in 1999) and the renovation of the historic Suffolk Courthouse scheduled to be completed in 2003.

The Nashua Street site was proposed to the Massachusetts Bar Association and was met with resistance. The Post Office Square Courthouse was examined as well, but the federal government is not selling the building. The Saltonstall Building is not available for court uses, and neither is City Hall Plaza. The Pemberton Square site is currently used as a courthouse, but the building is restricted for renovation and won't work for the design that modern courts now require and would not be able to accommodate growth. The Lindemann Center site has the opportunity for court uses, as it is owned by the Commonwealth and near the existing Brooke Courthouse. It is a complex building, with the Department of Mental Health (DMH) housed there, but the courts would like to have it examined more closely.

A site plan of the Lindemann Center was shown, which included the details of where the DMH would be consolidated. The DMH administrative offices would be relocated to the Saltonstall Building which would improve the functionality of the site for DMH. A detailed study of this site is in progress.

As a site for the new Suffolk Trial Court, the Lindemann Center is attractive to the state because of its location next to the Brooke Courthouse. Some issues that need further study are the status of the building as a landmark, which would require minimal or no demolition, and the cost and schedule of the project. The project would involve infill of the courtyard and renovation of the existing building. The DMH would be isolated to one wing, and the rest would be office space. There could be an atrium connecting the new building (infill of courtyard) to the existing building, which would improve site circulation. Floor plans were shown with the advantages of secure parking, multiple access points for loading and detainees, and an adequate footprint for the courts.

Regarding the Saltonstall Building, construction should be complete in 2003. DCAM will lease space back in that building. The project, being developed by Massachusetts Development Finance Agency/Saltonstall Building Redevelopment Corporation, calls for the renovation of the existing 632,000 square foot building for the construction of approximately 38,500 square feet of retail space, seventy-five (75) residential condominium units, and the reconfiguration of the existing 110,000 square foot parking garage for the provision of 466 spaces.

Rebecca Barnes then asked Liz Minnis to address the supermarket issue with the Lindemann Center site. The BRA has had a study completed which shows the

MEETING #4 cont.

Lindemann Center is a good site for a supermarket based on location and road networks.

Liz responded that DCAM is aware of this issue. Before they had their plans finalized for the courthouse, a consultant looked at the space and found that a supermarket would not be feasible, for reasons such as the incompatibility of a courthouse and a supermarket, security and loading issues. Liz stated that it would not be affordable for a developer to build a supermarket at that site with all of the state constraints on the site.

The discussion included concerns from community members regarding the analyses of several state-owned neighborhood buildings that have been ruled out by DCAM for supermarket use. The community would like an affordable supermarket to serve Beacon Hill, the West End, and the North End, and to have livelier, more active street edges around the institutional blocks that abut these neighborhoods. It was mentioned by several audience members, including Representative Paul Demakis, that it is not unreasonable to ask the state to give something back to the communities in which there is a strong state presence and where it is generally agreed that there is a problem created by the lack of affordable grocery alternatives. In addressing these concerns, Liz further elaborated on the security concerns at the Lindemann as well as footprint size and layout issues at state-owned facilities that create serious constraints for would-be supermarket developers.

BOSTON TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT: TRANSPORTATION OVERVIEW
Presenter: Vineet Gupta, BTM Director of Policy and Planning

Vineet Gupta introduced Alison Felix, Transportation Planner and Jim McCarthy, Senior Transportation Planner.

Vineet began with an overview of BTM's Transportation Planning Principles which include:

- Developing community-based strategies that enhance the quality of life
- Manage the cumulative transportation impact of new development projects
- Keep regional traffic on the highway system and local traffic on neighborhood streets
- Adopt a "transit first" approach in addressing congestion and access
- Develop a transportation vision in tandem with the urban design vision

An explanation of BTM's participation followed:

- Comprehensive district planning in coordination with BRA
- Negotiate transportation mitigation programs with development projects
- Manage off-street parking supply
- Enforce curb regulations and maintain signals
- Oversee Construction Management Plans
- Coordinate with MBTA and state transportation agencies

A site map of development projects and concepts was shown which pointed out the following projects: Saltonstall, Charles River Plaza, 226 Causeway Street, the Hoffman Building, Nashua Street, Emerson Place, MGH IMP, Yawkey Center, Charles Street Jail Hotel.

MEETING #4 cont.

Transportation projects through 2006 were reviewed, including the following:

1. Charles Circle Station and area reconstruction
2. Cambridge Street reconstruction
3. Merrimac Street reconstruction
4. Green/Orange Line Superstation
5. Leverett Circle pedestrian bridge/Nashua Street
6. Martha Road/Lomasney Way Green Line reconstruction
7. Causeway Street reconstruction
8. Haymarket bus station reconstruction

A diagram of the future roadway network after the Central Artery/Tunnel project is completed was shown.

West End Area streets reconstruction:

1. Cambridge Street: construction from summer '02 to summer '04, realignment of street with median, two lanes in each direction with left turn lanes, brick sidewalks, new trees, planters and pendant lights on both sides of street.
2. Merrimac Street: construction underway with fall '03 completion, two lanes in each direction with island and trees on both sides of street.
3. Leverett Circle: construction underway with spring '05 completion, new at-grade crossings at O'Brien and Nashua streets, new pedestrian bridge, MDC's Nashua Park with spring '03 completion and all connections complete by winter '04.
4. Martha Road: coordinated with removal of elevated T, construction with spring '05 completion, two lane roadway and new trees and plantings.

Transportation issues that BTD focuses on include:

- Pedestrian safety including crosswalks, sidewalks and streetscape
- Pedestrian paths to MBTA stations and parks/open space system
- Problem intersections and cut-through traffic
- Reduce volume of car-trips and parking spaces
- Traffic circulation patterns
- Curbside regulations and their enforcement
- Truck impacts

The discussion included community input on specific intersections where there are safety issues, including the need for better vehicular traffic management (outside the Kennedy Building garage) and the hazards of pedestrian crossings at Leverett Circle. There was clarification regarding the prospective completion date for Merrimac Street (scheduled at that time for fall 2003). There were also a few comments about the dangers posed by brick sidewalks to those who use wheelchairs and canes. BTD stated that this has been a concern and that the engineering for these types of surfaces has greatly improved in recent years.

MEETING #4 cont.

MASSACHUSETTS BAY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Presenter: Barbara Boylan, MBTA Director of Design

Barbara began with an update of the North Station Superstation and Leverett Circle. North Station has been under construction since 1995 and the Green Line should be completed by 2004. She described the changes to this station, including platforms to cross between the Green and Orange lines, and a pedestrian link to the Old Garden site. There will be a 16,000 sq. ft. train lobby, and the station will be intermodal (Orange and Green lines as well as commuter rail). The MBTA expects to award the contract in July 2002 and issue a Notice to Proceed in August, for completion in May 2005. While the Green Line is taken down, bus service will run from North Station to Lechmere, from about May 2004 to May 2005. Traffic mitigation has been worked through during the MBTA's planning process.

Charles Street Station:

A design competition was initiated in 1998 to solicit ideas for improving access and modernizing this station; construction of the new station will begin after Labor Day of this year. Barbara went through the city agencies that have worked on this project and explained that the new station will be 150 feet further up Cambridge Street than it is now—this will involve a land swap with MDC.

Issues and factors that the MBTA has examined include traffic circulation (traffic will be shifted, but the capacity will still be met), and access to the station. There will be a crosswalk from the CVS to the station and pedestrians will also be able to cross to the MGH side. Landscaping will be included with the project. The design of the station uses a great deal of glass so the station interior is daylit and visible from the outside at night; it will have an enlarged waiting area. The tracks and platforms will remain where they are today. The MBTA is committed to noise barriers and the project will include a 10 foot sound wall above the tracks. The existing headhouse will be demolished.

The discussion included comments from the audience regarding the need for installing properly located elevators, providing full handicap accessibility, and undertaking general upgrades to the appearance at Science Park station. MBTA signs currently incorrectly display that this is an accessible station. Barbara explained that while there is nothing in the plans right now for this station, it will be on a list for the future.

MEETING #4 cont.

CENTRAL ARTERY/TUNNEL PROJECT

Presenter: Peter Smith, Central Artery Community Liaison

Peter Smith updated the residents on the progress of the CA/T. The following information can be found at: <http://www.bigdig.com/thtml/schedule.htm>

Remaining Milestones of the Central Artery/Tunnel Project:
November 2002: I-90 Extension

The opening of the I-90/Massachusetts Turnpike extension will take place in three phases. The first to open will be I-90 westbound from Route 1A to Logan Airport and the Ted Williams Tunnel (TWT) meeting the existing Mass Pike westbound to Routes 128, 495 and western Massachusetts. Shortly thereafter, I-90 eastbound opens from its current terminus at I-93, under the Fort Point Channel and South Boston through the TWT to the airport and Route 1A. Also, a major interchange in South Boston will provide direct access to development in the area, including the new convention center. In a few weeks a new I-93 northbound ramp to I-90 eastbound will open. The TWT, which is currently restricted to commercial vehicles, will be opened to all traffic.

December 2002: Northbound Central Artery/I-93

The northbound lanes of the underground Central Artery will begin carrying traffic about a year before the southbound lanes. Northbound traffic will begin using the ten-lane, cable-stayed Leonard P. Zakim Bunker Hill Bridge across the Charles River at the same time.

November 2003: Southbound Central Artery/I-93*

Opening of the southbound lanes of the underground expressway will take approximately one year longer than the northbound lanes because southbound traffic will use the existing Dewey Square (South Station) Tunnel. The transition from an above-ground approach to the tunnel to one from the underground highway requires a more complicated construction sequence. The Dewey Square Tunnel will be completely refurbished to carry southbound traffic only.

*Note: The Project Management Monthly (PMM) as of February 28, 2002, reports a schedule delay of approximately one month for southbound Central Artery/I-93 and for project completion. This delay will be reevaluated as part of the project's Annual Cost/Schedule analysis in mid-2002.

MEETING #4 cont.

December 2004: Project Completion*

Demolition of the elevated Central Artery will begin once southbound traffic has begun using the underground expressway. Restoration of the surface will follow, including landscaping and other amenities, creating 27 acres of open space along the old highway corridor. Three quarters of that space will remain open, with modest commercial and residential development on the rest. Construction on the development parcels will begin after the Central Artery project is finished.

Update on the Sumner Tunnel:

Starting Saturday June 8, 2002, the Sumner Tunnel will operate one travel lane only between 7:00 a.m. and 10 p.m. on Saturdays throughout the summer. Two travel lanes will be provided at all other times.

The discussion focussed on the emergency plans for fires/smoke in the tunnel. Artery representatives stated that emergency stations will be open 24 hours, with tow trucks and ambulances, located above-ground near on-ramps. Variable message signs will be used and the tunnel has been designed so that systems are up-to-date and motorists will be aware of problems well in advance. There was a request for collaboration between the MBTA and the CA/T, and it was stated that a representative from the MBTA would be at the next CA/T meeting.

THE DAVIS COMPANIES: CHARLES RIVER PLAZA

Presenter: Paul Marcus, Principal

The Davis Companies has had discussions with MGH about the possibility of MGH as a tenant for the project. The goal is to start the project by the end of this year.

There will be a newsletter process to update abutters of the construction plans. The CVS will remain open (and will expand) and the Stop & Shop will be closing in January 2003. The Stop & Shop will be replaced by Bread & Circus.

The project is still continuing with design review and includes some Blossom Street entrance improvements.

Construction will take about 1½ years and the Davis Companies will be talking to the community throughout the process.

Charles River Limited Partnership proposes to develop approximately 397,000 net new sq. ft. of office/lab/R&D space and 10,000 sq. ft. of street-front retail in two structures at Charles River Plaza on Cambridge Street. The project received BRA Board approval on 12/6/01.

The discussion included clarification regarding what space MGH would have in the new development (the majority of the North Structure) and also regarding the property owned by Davis behind Blossom Court. The company has a long term lease with Pace's, and has renewed leases with the dry cleaner and travel agent. It was commented that the neighborhood is very happy with Pace's.

MEETING #4 cont.

MEETING #5

WEST END AREA PLANNING GROUP MEETING #5 MINUTES

Rebecca Barnes, Moderator

Date: June 24, 2002
Time: 6:15-8:45 p.m.
Location: Shriners Hospital Auditorium, Boston MA
City Staff Attending: *Boston Redevelopment Authority:* Rebecca Barnes, Sonal Gandhi, Lisa Greenfield, Leanna Hush, Kim Jones, Katie Lee, Richard Shaklik, Don Wiest
Boston Transportation Department: Alison Felix, Vineet Gupta, Jim McCarthy

West End Area Planning

Group Members Attending: Jane Forrestall, Linda Ellenbogen, Norman Herr, David Hanitchak, Paul Schratter, Ivy Turner, Carol Robinson, Patrick Faherty, John Fitzgerald, Harold Dennis, Robert Works, Malek Al-Khatib, Kevin McNamara

The meeting began at 6:30 p.m.

Rebecca Barnes welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed why and how the City is conducting this community planning process. She stated that a Planning Group was appointed to ensure consistent representation of all area constituencies throughout the process, but that all meetings are open to the public and that everyone should feel encouraged to participate. Rebecca explained that this was the fifth in a series of meetings offering presentations of existing conditions as well as of imminent changes to the vicinity in the near future.

At a previous meeting, Rebecca agreed to accommodate a request from participants to have no meetings of this type in July or August. She explained that while honoring that request, she did however want to invite members of the Planning Group to meet with her and other city staff once during the summer to provide input on how the rest of the planning process, including a September workshop, should proceed. (This meeting is meant primarily to be a discussion about the goals and logistics of the September workshop—an event that will be advertised widely in advance and in which everyone will be welcome to participate.) In response to a request for scheduling preferences, most Planning Group members had responded that August 8 or July 22 work best. Rebecca stated that a date will soon be selected and announced. (*The meeting has now been scheduled for August 8 from 5–7 p.m. in the BRA Board Room in City Hall.)

*PLEASE SAVE THE DATE: Saturday September 14th is the tentative date for the workshop / charrette! Details are forthcoming.

MEETING #5 cont.

NORTH AREA PLANNING INITIATIVE (NAPI)

Presenter: David Neilson

Rebecca introduced urban design consultant David Neilson to present the work of the NAPI. (Both Bob O'Brien and Biss Antikarov, Planning Group members affiliated with the NAPI, regretted that they were unable to make it to the meeting to participate in this presentation.)

David stated that this ongoing planning process began two years ago and is supported by Move Massachusetts, the Downtown North Association, and the Artery Business Committee (ABC) along with others, with all funds matched by the Massachusetts Development Finance Agency. There were bimonthly meetings and two subcommittees. The intent of the process was to identify redevelopment opportunities being created in the area given the impending arrival of a new surface artery. Participants explored how coming changes to the area would effect development interests there. The process was very interactive, using models to help everyone understand the issues.

The NAPI's study area was defined by North Washington, Sudbury, Cambridge streets, and the Charles River. The process was designed to enable a large group of stakeholders to examine "what if?" scenarios together, and to establish a plan before any development proposals were made for sites in this part of the city. David emphasized that there is no "right or wrong" among these ideas.

A few of the many principles articulated through the NAPI process for guiding future change to the area include: enhanced pedestrian, vehicle and visual connections between subdistricts and to other parts of the downtown; maintenance and expansion of the current variety of uses in the area; diminishing the impact of transportation infrastructure; and enhancing connections to the river and between open public spaces there and within the study area. David also discussed how building densities might be sensitively increased in some areas to the fulfillment of the agreed-upon principles, and also touched upon how a supermarket use might be located in or near the Lindemann-Hurley complex. David presented the extensive urban design analysis that served as a basis for some of the ideas. David stated that copies of the book produced in this process can be ordered through Biss Antikarov at the ABC.

Comments from audience: Objection to putting a "fortress" over a garage and to anything that will block views to the new bridge and other scenic areas. Also a call to "clean up the North Station area."

MEETING #5 cont.

Question from the audience: Is the corner of Lindemann-Hurley (Merrimac and Staniford streets) designated as open space or parking? David responded that it is open space.

ZONING PRESENTATION

Presenter: Rick Shaklik, BRA Deputy Director for Zoning

Rick presented some background information on zoning in Boston as well as some information particular to the West End Study Area. The following is the outline of his presentation.

I. Boston Zoning Code

- A. Large (three-volume) complex set of land use regulations and dimensional regulations for buildings; controls development in the city.

Includes:

- Process for reviewing and assessing the impact of projects

- Mechanism for planning and developing specific regulations for large parcels (PDA)

- Mechanism for amending and modifying regulations

- Not a static document; built-in flexibility designed to respond to changing goals, plans, and needs of the city

- B. This presentation discusses what is applicable to West End Study Area; and attempts to simplify 4 parts:

- 1. Underlying or “base zoning”
 - 2. Zoning overlays
 - 3. Process for reviewing projects and plans
 - 4. Zoning relief

II. West End Study Area/Base Zoning (includes three different zoning districts or areas) indicated by red dotted line on the map in the PowerPoint presentation

- A. Government Center/Markets District

- 1. Lindemann-Hurley complex

- B. Cambridge Street North District

- 1. Charles Street Jail
 - 2. MGH Garages
 - 3. Charles River Plaza
 - 4. SPNEA and Old West

C. General Code Area

MEETING #5 cont.

1. MGH main campus
2. Mass. Eye and Ear
3. Charles River Park

III. Government Center/Markets District—date implemented 1991

A. Use and Dimensional Regulations in Article 46/Map 1H

B. Subdistricts in West End Study Area (three districts)

1. Pemberton Square Protection Area—along Staniford St.
 - a. Height: 125'
 - b. FAR: 8
2. New Chardon Street Medium Density Area—New Chardon/Merrimac streets
 - a. Height: 125'/155'
 - b. FAR: 8/10

IV. Cambridge Street North District—1992

A. Use and dimensional regulations in Article 47A/Map 1K

B. Subdistricts (5) entirely within West End Study Area

1. Cambridge Street North Side Protection Area (Charles Circle to Staniford)—most restrictive
 - a. Height: 65'
 - b. FAR: 4/5
2. Charles Street Jail South Protection Area
 - a. Height: 125'
 - b. FAR: 5
3. Blossom Street Restricted Growth Area
 - a. Height: 80'/100'
 - b. FAR: 6/7
4. North Grove Street Restricted Growth Area
 - a. Height: 65'/100'
 - b. FAR: 4/7
5. Charles Street Jail North Medium Density Area
 - a. Height: 125'/155'
 - b. FAR: 5
6. Height range for district 65'–155'/FAR 4-7

MEETING #5 cont.

V. General Code Area—MGH/CRP

- A. Use and dimensional regulations in Volume I, Article 8 and Article 13
- B. Districts within West End Study Area (three types of underlying districts)
 - 1. H District—Apartment/Multi-family (H-3, H-4)
 - a. Height: none
 - b. FAR: 3-4
 - 2. L District—Local Business (L-2) (Blossom Court commercial building)
 - a. Height: none
 - b. FAR: 2
 - 3. B District—General Business (B-4) (Small area north of Charles River Plaza)
 - a. Height: none
 - b. FAR: 4

VI. Overlay Districts

Layers that supplement and/or replace underlying zoning provisions
Require public hearing and approval by Zoning Commission (ZC) as
amendment to Code. Three districts to be discussed—four including Restricted
Parking District

- A. Downtown Interim Planning Overlay District (1987)
 - 1. Covers General Code Area—MGH/CRP
- B. Planned Development Areas (2)
 - 1. Charles River Park
 - 2. Mass General
- C. Urban Renewal Areas (3)
 - 1. Shriners
 - 2. Lowell Square
 - 3. Charles River Plaza

VII. Downtown Interim Planning Overlay District

- A. Medium Growth Subdistrict
 - 1. Height: 125'—restricts height (155' with Board of Appeal approval)
 - 2. FAR: 8—increases FAR (10 with Board of Appeal approval)
- B. PDAs not allowed

VIII. PDAs**MEETING #5 cont.**

- A. PDA # 7 Charles River Park (Longfellow Place, 50 Staniford, Parking Garage, Amy Lowell House) (H-3-D)
 - 1. 1972
 - 2. 9.2 acres
 - 3. Part of Parcels 2—1E—1F of the West End Land Assembly and Redevelopment Project
 - 4. Permitted uses—residential, retail, parking, office, sports facility
- B. PDA #15 Mass General Hospital
 - 1. 1982 (as amended)
 - 2. In excess of 10.5 acres
 - 3. Permitted uses—hospital and accessory uses (research, offices, clinics, keeping of lab animals)

IX. Urban Renewal Areas or “U” District

Designation by the Zoning Commission, through Amendment process, of an area within an Urban Renewal Plan area.

Use and dimensional controls are the use and dimensional controls of the urban renewal plan and land disposition agreement related to the parcel

- A. Shriners Burns Institute (1992)
- B. Lowell Square/West End Place (1994)
- C. Charles River Plaza (April 2001)

X. Development Review Process (Article 80)

Adopted in 1996 to consolidate development review regulations, make them easier to use and understand and to apply the regulations consistently throughout the city. (See *Citizen’s Guide to Development Review* for overview. [This document was available at the meeting, and can be attained at the BRA at no cost.])

- A. Large Project Review
 - 1. 50,000 sq. ft. threshold for new construction
 - 2. Multi-step process to analyze impacts of proposed project such as:
 - a. Transportation and parking
 - b. Environment (wind, shadow, noise)
 - c. Urban design
 - d. Historic resources
 - e. Infrastructure (water, sewer, electricity)

MEETING #5 cont.

3. Process
 - a. PNF (Project Notification Form)
 - b. Scoping (45 days after PNF)
 - c. Draft Project Impact Report (DPIR)/Preliminary Adequacy Determination (PAD)
 - d. Final Project Impact Report (FPIR)/Adequacy Determination (AD)—BRA public hearing
 - e. Certification and implementation (cooperation agreement, Design Review, certification of compliance, permitting and project construction)
 4. Impact Advisory Group (IAG)
Executive Order relative to mitigation of large projects; an IAG assists the BRA in determining appropriate mitigation
- B. Planned Development Areas (PDAs)
1. Plan for larger areas, appropriate to location, may not be accommodated by underlying zoning, such as a development involving a large building, group of buildings or mix of uses.
 2. Development plan must be approved by BRA and Zoning Commission (ZC)
 3. Plan must specify:
 - a. Proposed location, dimensions, and appearance of all buildings
 - b. Proposed uses, parking, and landscaping
 - c. Public benefits
 4. Process
 - a. PDA plan files
 - b. Comment period for 45 days
 - c. BRA public hearing within 60 days
 - d. Zoning Commission hearing and adoption
- C. Institutional Master Plan (IMP) required city-wide by amendment 2 years ago
1. required to insure that expansion of hospitals or colleges enhances surrounding community and city
 2. comprehensive development plan that describes:
 - a. existing facilities
 - b. long-range planning goals
 - c. proposed projects
 3. update and renewal periodically and amended when it adds or changes projects over threshold (20,000)
 4. Creates new zoning regulations based on plan

5. Process

MEETING #5 cont.

- a. Institutional Master Plan Notification Form (IMPNF)—comment period, 30 days—scoping, 45 days
- b. IMP filed—comment period (60 days)—BRA public hearing (90 days)
- c. Zoning Commission hearing and adoption

XI. Zoning Relief

A. Zoning Amendment

1. Petition to Zoning Commission for text or map change
 - a. Usually by BRA, as City's planning agency
 - b. Often as part of the City's comprehensive rezoning process
 - c. Any citizen has right to petition the ZC for a zoning change
2. BRA is responsible for advising the ZC before the ZC considers a zoning change
3. A public hearing, duly advertised, is held by the ZC before considering a zoning text for map amendment

B. Zoning Appeal

1. Zoning Board of Appeal may grant zoning relief from provisions of the Code through the conditional use or variance process
2. Petitioner may file an appeal at Inspectional Services Department (ISD) after permit application has been denied for zoning violations
3. BRA makes recommendations on appeals to Board of Appeal
4. Board of Appeal holds public hearing, then abutters are notified, then a hearing is advertised, then Board makes decision
5. Board can grant relief only for specific provisions of Code in question
6. Criteria for conditional use permit and variance is included in the Code (Articles 6 and 7)

C. Planned Development Area

1. Zoning Commission adopts development plan which determines dimensional, design, parking, circulation, open space and landscaping of proposed project
2. Overlays and supersedes underlying zoning

D. Urban Renewal Area

1. Zoning Commission adopts Urban Renewal designation for specific area within an Urban Renewal Plan
2. Overlays and supersedes underlying zoning

MEETING #5 cont.

E. Institutional Master Plan

1. Zoning Commission adopts Institutional Master Plan for specific area
2. Overlays and supersedes underlying zoning

WEST END URBAN RENEWAL PLAN OVERVIEW

Presenter: Don Wiest, BRA Land Use Counsel

Don discussed how the West End urban renewal plan works as well as the relationship between this type of regulation and the zoning controls for the area.

Zoning controls what structures may be built, and what uses may take place, on property throughout Boston. In a few areas of the city, such as the West End, land use is also controlled by an urban renewal plan. This plan is formally called the West End Land Assembly and Redevelopment Plan, referred to here as the “Plan.”

Creation of Plan/Contrast with Zoning:

Zoning controls have been in place within the City of Boston since 1924. The West End Plan, by contrast, was implemented in connection with a neighborhood-specific urban renewal scheme that got underway in the late 1950s. The Plan was enacted by the City Council on July 22, 1957. On July 26, 1957, the Mayor of the City of Boston approved the City Council’s action, thus rendering the Plan operative. Afterwards, the specified land within the neighborhood was either purchased or judicially taken by the City of Boston, and was then cleared for redevelopment.

The land within the Urban Renewal Area was then divided into parcels, and each parcel was designated for one of several different use classifications. A Master Leasehold covering the entire Plan area was executed with the chosen redeveloper, and, over time, the individual parcels were leased for development as the developer’s specific plans for those parcels were approved. The leases transferring this land contained dimensional and use restrictions consistent with the terms of the Plan. These restrictions vary by type of parcel. There are also fairly specific restrictions on the types of uses permitted within each type of redevelopment parcel. The leases to the redevelopment parcels contained options to purchase, with the condition that the deeds transferred must remain subject to the Plan restrictions appropriate to that parcel.

The Plan thus differs from zoning in terms of how it binds land owners and users. Zoning represents legislative restrictions on the use of land—it is law that is imposed upon all land within Boston’s city limits. Although the Urban Renewal Plan began as legislation, it binds the use of land primarily through contract. As the Plan provides in Section B(3)(B), restrictions set out in the Plan “shall be binding and effective upon all purchasers of land, their heirs and assigns, in that section of Boston identified as the West End Land Assembly and Redevelopment Project Area”

MEETING #5 cont.

Plan/Code Interplay:

Any new development within the West End is subject to both the Plan and zoning, to the extent that both apply to the project. This means that any property owner must comply simultaneously with all the limitations imposed by both of these sets of controls. Plan Section G(5) states that “[w]hen there is any difference between these restrictions and the standards of the Zoning Regulations, Building Code, or other legal requirement, the most restrictive shall govern.”

A U-District is a type of specialized subdistrict within an urban renewal area in which only the controls of the relevant urban renewal plan apply, as opposed to the controls of both that plan and the zoning code. Boston Zoning Code Section 3-1A(b) states that, “[u]pon application from the Boston Redevelopment Authority, the whole or any part of a subdistrict may be established as an urban renewal area [i.e., U-District] if all land within such urban renewal area . . . consists solely of land . . . with respect to which an agreement has been entered into with said Authority establishing use and dimensional controls as specified in a land assembly and redevelopment, or urban renewal plan, as defined in Chapter 121 of the General Laws.” This section further provides that “the provisions of this code establishing use, dimensional, parking, and loading requirements . . . shall not apply to urban renewal areas”

Changes to the Plan:

It is important to understand when discussing the Plan that it is a plan only. While comprehensive in its scope and well-thought-through, it is not set in stone. Plan Section G(2), entitled “Amendments to the Redevelopment Plan,” states that, “[s]ubject to applicable Federal, State, and local laws, this Plan may be modified after lease or sale of any land in the Project Area, provided that such modifications are consented to by the lessee or purchaser of the property affected by the proposed modifications and by the Boston Redevelopment Authority.”

In 1972, the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court—the state equivalent to the United States Supreme Court—addressed the process by which modifications to

MEETING #5 cont.

the Plan may take place. The issue before the Court was the decision by the City of Boston not to construct a school on what was identified as Parcel 2 of the West End Redevelopment Area. Instead, the property would be redeveloped to contain two 35-story apartment buildings, a 10-story office building, 1,200 enclosed parking spaces, tennis courts, a swimming pool, and a skating rink. The State Department of Community Affairs, or DCA, which is today the Department of Housing and Community Development, sued on the theory that such changes required its prior approval.

The Court dismissed the DCA's contentions, ruling that the BRA did not need to submit such changes in the Plan to the DCA for approval. Commissioner of the Department of Community Affairs v. BRA, 362 Mass. 602 (1971). As the Court noted, the enabling legislation, G.L. c. 121, s. 26J, referred to the land assembly and redevelopment plan "as it may exist from time to time." Id. at 614. Thus, the Court concluded, the legislation "clearly contemplated the possibility of revisions." Id. In addition, the Court pointed out, "s. 26KK, which required DCA approval of the original plan, did not require approval of revisions." Id. The Court further observed that the language of the Plan itself that relates to modifications also does not require DCA approval.

The Court suggested that DCA approval "might" be required in a situation in which "the nature and magnitude of the revisions of a plan could fundamentally alter the essence of the project." Id. at 618. The Court emphasized, however, that "[a]ny assessment of the magnitude" of changes "must be made with reference to the plan as a whole, not simply with reference to the affected parcel." Id.

Accordingly, as the Court has made clear, the provisions of the Plan, as they apply to a specific parcel within the West End, may be modified by agreement of the BRA and the owner of the property in question. Such modification is impermissible only where the change in question would "fundamentally alter the essence" of the Plan as a whole.

Duration of the Plan:

Plan Section B(3)(A)(6) states that "[t]he following restrictions shall be binding and effective . . . for a period of 50 years from the date of adoption of the Plan by the Boston City Council." This Section then sets forth what is known as an "evergreen," or self-renewing, provision: it states that "[s]aid restrictions shall be automatically extended for successive ten (10) year periods unless terminated by a vote of a majority of the owners with the approval of the Boston City Council."

Ownership and Maintenance of Easements:

Regarding the maintenance of the footpath crossing through the West End: Plan Section B(3)(A)(6) states that "[t]he developer is to purchase all the land of a delivery parcel including that portion of the 'public foot path' contained within a delivery parcel. The developer shall grant to the Authority an easement for the construction of

the ‘public foot path’ and an easement making the ‘public foot path’ a right-of-way for pedestrian travel. The foot path will be dedicated for public uses and transferred by the Authority to the City of Boston for such purposes only.”

MEETING #5 cont.

Plan Section B(3)(B)(2)(e)(ii) provides that “[o]wners of property abutting on a public walkway shall be responsible for maintaining that portion of said easements which is lawn and shrubbery and between their lot lines and all public sidewalks. Owners of the property shall also be responsible for installing and maintaining all lawn spaces between public sidewalks for curbs.”

Questions/Comments:

A question regarding the meaning of “majority of owners” in terms of condo owners or parcel owners was asked. Don Weist responded that it has not yet been tested in the courts; residential condominiums were not contemplated in the drafting of the documents. A member of the community stated that they understood this planning process to be a result of the upcoming expiration of the Urban Renewal Plan, but that per Don Weist’s presentation it seems that the Urban Renewal Plan can automatically renew itself.

Rebecca Barnes responded that the planning process is being conducted in an effort to share information about planning and to establish a clear framework for future planning that includes community values.

A specific question was asked if whether the owner of Parcel A, if they want to make a change, needs the approval from the owners of Parcel B. Don Weist responded that no, each is contractual between the two parties. A question regarding the termination of the Plan was asked. Don Weist responded that the BRA has never been presented with the issue of termination, but that many parties would probably weigh in.

There were a few questions of clarification regarding how the Downtown IPOD changes the FAR restrictions and how the annual renewal process that the IPOD requires is advertised to the public. Rick stated that since it was created in 1987 it has been annually renewed, using the BRA’s standard notification process, including a notice in the Boston Herald, which is the City’s paper of record.

A question was asked whether the owners of the Lindemann–Hurley buildings were subject to the Plan. Don and Rebecca responded that they are owned by the Commonwealth (Division of Capital Asset Management—DCAM) and that DCAM is of the position that they can do what they want. The City has pushed back on this issue. The State typically abides by the zoning as a matter of courtesy. It was also noted that the City commissioned a study for potential supermarket locations in the vicinity, which found the Lindemann–Hurley to be a desirable site.

MEETING #5 cont.

Clarification on what constitutes a “fundamental change” was requested. Don responded that in the Blackstone case, the Court stated that those particular changes (as mentioned above) were not enough to shift from the fundamentally residential character of the area.

A comment was made that it seems that unless something has large historical value (Fenway Park was given as an example), all Emerson needs to do is go to the BRA to get approved. More time on this subject was requested. Questions/comments on the accuracy of the map were made. A question was asked as to what an individual can do to lobby and work with the State regarding the Lindemann planning. Rebecca responded that they should talk to Liz Minnis of DCAM, who is on the West End Area Planning Group.

Comments were made regarding the confusion of what happens in 2007. When individuals decided to move to the area, they believed that they had an understanding of the Plan, but that turns out not to be the case. Rebecca responded that existing conditions are not set in stone. Constraints exist but they can be changed and they are meant to be flexible. This is a universal situation in the City and the country due to the way we use the law.

A verbatim version of Don’s presentation was requested in the meeting minutes. A comment was made that it seems like it comes down to what the City wants. Rebecca and Don responded that through the review process a project can change drastically and that it is about balancing competing goals and the sentiments of the stakeholders involved.

A question was asked that with the building height restricted to 155 feet and a FAR of 8-10 if a 155-foot building could be proposed. Don responded yes, but it would have to go through the Article 80 process due to the number of square feet.

A specific question regarding the lease of 20,000 sq. ft. by MGH and not triggering the IMP process was asked. The space MGH will lease in the Charles River Plaza will be for research use and not patient care, therefore IMP process was not triggered.

Copies of the Urban Renewal Plan can be requested from the Executive Secretary’s office at the BRA.

Rebecca thanked Shriners for the use of their facility and stated that she’d send a letter. She thanked David Neilson for his presentation.

WEST END AREA PLANNING MEETING #6 MINUTES

MEETING #5 cont.

Rebecca Barnes, Moderator

Date: November 6, 2002
Time: 6:00–8:00 p.m.
Location: Shriners Burns Hospital, Boston MA
City Staff Attending: *Boston Redevelopment Authority:* Rebecca Barnes, Kimberly Jones, Katie Lee
Boston Transportation Department: Alison Felix

West End Area Planning

Group Members Attending: Jane Forrestall, Ivy Turner, Biss Antikarov, Linda Ellenbogen, John Fitzgerald, David Hanitchak, Paula Higgins, Jim McCarthy, Robert Works, Malek Al-Khatib, Paul Schratter

Rebecca Barnes, Chief Planner for the City of Boston and Moderator of the West End Area Planning effort, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Everyone present introduced himself or herself. Rebecca apologized that at the last meeting, some participants hadn't gotten an opportunity to speak, and stated that in the future meetings would be moderated in such a way to ensure all could be heard.

Rebecca gave a presentation that reviewed what we've been doing so far and where we're going in this process. After reviewing the purpose and goals of the process, what meetings and workshops have produced to date, Rebecca spent the last portion of the presentation going over the "genius statements" that had been produced in response to feedback from the Planning Group at a prior meeting. (Planning Group members had asked City staff to reexamine the draft principles, redraft them in such a way that they addressed specific places within the West End Area and not the entire district, and to begin this redrafting process by writing a summary—a "genius statement"—for each category of principle.) Rebecca read through each of these draft "genius statements"—also called *overview statements*—for the categories: community character, transportation, open space, community facilities, and land use. The presentation ended with Don Kindsvatter of Von Grossmann & Company, consultants on this process, reviewing what will be the table of contents for the Framework Document that will be produced to report on the findings of this planning process.

Comments from the audience:

Many people expressed satisfaction with the tone, content and direction of the overview statements, and there were many affirmations of the sentiments expressed in the statements regarding preserving the pedestrian character and tremendous importance of open space to this community.

There were also suggestions from the audience for the next phase of drafting the principles. These included the addition of language about: the importance of different government entities working better together, the need for upgrades at Science Park station, the need for improving the area around Nashua Street, and the lack of places for limousines to park without blocking important access routes. There were questions

MEETING #6 cont.

surrounding pedestrian safety concerns and signage on Blossom Street, and what is being done about these issues. (There is an ongoing working group looking specifically at issues on Blossom Street, which meets on the last Tuesday of each month, on the 3rd floor of Bartlett; the public is welcome.)

City Councilor Mike Ross suggested that there be a group walk-through of the area with the people who know it best. It would be a good opportunity for some participants to get to know the West End Area better. Councilor Ross stated that the Framework Document being created in this process has the opportunity to be something, and he welcomed comments on and expressions of interest in the idea of a neighborhood walk-through.

In response to questions regarding scheduling, Rebecca stated that the team of City staff and consultants would like the opportunity to respond to the concerns and ideas expressed and in drafting the planning principles. She noted that this West End Area process was designed as a community conversation about the development pressures in the area, and that intent has been met with the series of meetings held since May 2002, and will conclude with the publication of a report this spring.